SHRI S. B. CHAVAN : Sir, I move :

"That the Bill be passed."

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

STATEMENT BY THE MINISTER

Alleged Electronic Surveillance of Telephone of Minister of Human Resource Development

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI S. B. CHAVAN) : Sir, on 23rd March 1993, during the Zero Hour, Hon. Members raised the alleged issue of electronic surveillance of the telephone of Minister of HRD. In this connection Hon. Members demanded a clarification on the statement of Minister HRD. circumstances exist which require a conclusive enquiry.

Minister of State [IS] in the Ministry of Home Affairs had assured the Hon. Members that Government does not wish to hide anything and is prepared to examine this matter from all the angles. Government is willing to place all the information available to it before the House.

The Minister for HRD had, on February, 9th 1993, drawn the attention of the Prime Minister towards a news item that had appeared in a language daily published from Calcutta that the Prime Minister had directed the "Central Intelligence Department" to watch the activities of some Central Ministers. The News Item had also alleged that the Intelligence department had also started eavesdropping on the telephones of the Ministers. In this connection, the news item further mentioned that a surveillance is being kept on the persons who were meeting the Minister for HRD.

In his letter of 9th February, 1993 the Minister for HRD brought to the notice of the Prime Minister that a Private Agency engaged by him had in fact confirmed that "two of my telephones are indeed being subjected to illegal surveillance." The Minister for HRD requested for the immediate intervention of the Prime Minister.

The Prime Minister on the very day of receipt of the letter of the Minister for HRD made enquiries to ascertain if surveillance of the sort mentioned by the Minister for HRD has been carried out in any manner and was categorically assured by the agency mentioned in the news report that they have neither authorised such an action, nor 'indeed would it remotely occur to them to do so'. The result of this enquiry was communicated on 9th February, 1993.

Through another letter the Minister for HRD emphasized the need for a thorough investigation since issues of fundamental nature were involved. The concerned agency officials met the Minister for HRD and conducted electronic sweeping of the premises and the telephones in question. After a thorough technical enquiry the Agency came to the conclusion that the enquiry could not elicit any evidence to support that electronic surveillance was taking place as alleged. A copy of the report of the sweeping operations was sent to the Minister for HRD. The Minister in early March 1993 informed that the private agency that conducted an enquiry earlier stands by its conclusions The Minister suggested that to get to the truth the association of the private Agency that conducted the enquiry would be useful. This suggestion of the Minister for HRD was readily agreed to and the Minister has been requested to furnish the name of the private agency so that Intelligence Agency could associate with them and get to the root of the problem.

Sir, as mentioned in this august house on Tuesday, the policy of the government on this issue is very clear and open. No agency of the government are authorised to conduct any surveillance on anyone for political purposes. Government would do everything in its power to establish the facts. This is possible on receipt of the name of the private agency and gaining access to such evidence the agency has, which enabled it to reach a conclusion contrary to that of the Intelligence Agency.

SHRI SUNIL BASU RAY (West Bengal) : Sir, we have heard the statement read out by the hon. Minister and we have seen what the contents of the Human Resource Development Minister's letter are. Now it

is a unique situation in which we find a Cabinet Member himself alleging against his Government that he is under electronic surveillance. The statement given here does not conclusively prove it that he was not under surveillance. I thing certain questions which arise out of this matter of phone tapping, electronic surveillance and all these things, were raised in this House earlier also in regard to certain State Governments. So, I think, the Government should, first of all, clarify whether there are any issues behind these allegations of the hon. Minister of Human Resource Development which prompted him to draw the attention of the Prime Minister to this inglorious fact. If so, what are those issues ? The subsequent events also show that the Cabinet is not a unified family. It is neither united nor disciplined. We would like to know whether the nation can confide in and rely on a Cabinet which does not rectify its defects and weaknesses. Another point is whether the matter of reshuffle of, the Cabinet has anything to do with this fact.

So, one thing is quite clear. If we want to do away with all these things whether biased or unbiased, since this practice of phone tapping is there under the Indian Telephone Act, that Act should be properly amended so that this issue may not have any scope to raise its ugly head in future ? I would like to know whether the Government will do it or not. Will the Government order a probe into the allegation of the HRD Minister because the statement does not say that it has probed into the matter in detail and has come to a conclusion ? So, any practice which may have its adverse affect on people's democratic rights should be done away with immediately and the Government should come out with a clear statement on that.

SHRI G. G. SWELL (Meghalaya) : Sir, the statement of the Minister is inconclusive. He has promised that further enquiry would made because the HRD Minister has said that a private agency had reported to him and he persists in saying that his telephones have been tapped, electronic surveillance is being exercised over his telephone. This is a very strange, very unique, very unprecedented thing that a Minister of the Cabinet and that too a senior Minister who one time was the Leader in the Lok Sabha and now considered to be number two, should bring forward this kind of a charge against the Government. The only conclusion that we can arrive at is, the infighting within the Cabinet is more deadly than what has come up on the surface. Anyway, that is your matter, whatever you do about it. I am sure the Minister is very well aware that electronic intelligence gathering has become rather commonplace in all the developed countries in the world. They have the means of intercepting telephone conversation from air, not only national but even international. They have the means of listening in to the conversation of high officials while they are travelling in cars and speaking from telephones on their cars. It is not a new thing. I wonder whether your Government has got these means. If you don't, it is high time that you procured them. This country, Mr. Vice-Chairman, is facing a new danger today, not of a war with Pakistan which is of no less concern to us. What happened in Bombay must be an eye opener. What happened in Bombay came as a result of long-planning long discussions. It is unnerving to read reports that even today huge caches of all these sophisticated bombs, sensitives bombs and other things have been found in different parts of the country. Now there is one way. Well, you may use it against your Minister, that is your business. But I wish that you use these means against the terrorists, the enemies of this country, the home-grown terrorists. International terrorism has become an international industry nowadays.

I am sure, if you had the means and you had listened to their conversation, you would have been able to pre-empt whatever happened in Bombay. But we were caught entirely unawares. We were sitting ducks. I think the time has come for you to do this kind of surveillance against these things. You know what is happening in this country. If you know what is being plotted against this country, you would be able to take action against these people in time. Have you got these means ? Now it appears from the statement of the HRD Minister that private agencies are here in this country. You cannot prevent it. Now, Dunkel and GATT and all these things will come into this

country. We should be in step with the times; we should be in step with the rest of the world. Have you got the means ? Are you going to use these means against the enemies of this country, particularly the clandestine terrorist organisations who want to create terror in this country ?

PROF. SAURIN BHATTACHARYA (West Bengal) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, it seems to me that never before this type of statement had to be made before the House by the Home Minister of the country, this type meaning the allegation made by a senior Minister of the Cabinet regarding tapping of his telephone. The concern expressed on the 23rd of March was not merely about the allegation of tapping of Shri Arjun Singh's telephone, but also the underlying idea, whether this telephone tapping, whether electronic eavesdropping as the term has been used here, is in existence in the country. It is reassuring that the Home Minister has assured us that no agency of the Government is doing this thing. But as Mr. Sunil Basu Ray said, statement was inconclusive ... (*interruptions*) ...

SHRI G. G. SWELL : I said it.

PROF. SAURIN BHATTACHARYA : Oh, you said it ? I am sorry, Prof. Swell, you said it. Therefore, I should have kept it in mind more ... (*interruptions*) ... But the question is, it has been said here that it is Mr. Arjun Singh who suggested that it was a private agency which first gave the opinion that it detected this tapping and was associated with the task of sweeping the premises of Shri Arjun Singh ... (*interruptions*) ...

SHRI S. S. AHLUWALIA (Bihar) : Electronically.

PROF. SAURIN BHATTACHARYA : Naturally, electronically or some other thing, whatever it is. I am not very good at these terms ... (*interruptions*) ...

SHRI G. G. SWELL : You don't need to even do it electronically. It can be intercepted in the air ... (*interruptions*) ...

PROF. SAURIN BHATTACHARYA : But anyway, this private agency must be in possession of very sophisticated machinery and was associated with the task of sweeping the premises of Shri Arjun Singh and perhaps facts could be established. From the statement it seems that by sweeping a particular premises it can be said whether there has been any interception with the help of electronic media or otherwise. But why that thing has not happened ? Certain dates have been given but in this case no date has been given, when Mr. Arjun Singh suggested that the private agency be associated and when the Government agreed to it and why, before coming to the House, the outcome of that joint sweeping was not made known. Therefore, this statement, unfortunately, remains incomplete and perhaps our reaction now may not be that helpful. The Minister's assertion, I again say is that there is no such system. Without doubting the veracity of his statement yet, the doubt will prevail that there is something wrong, something rotten in the State of Denmark. Otherwise, how could this thing happen regarding the present day member of the royal family of India, that is the family which is running the country ? Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir.

SHRI JOHN F. FERNANDES (Goa) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I have no clarifications to seek from the statement because the matter is not concluded. But I would like to know one thing from the hon. Home Minister. He has mentioned about a private agency. May I know from the hon. Minister whether we have any registered private agencies in our country, whether they are legalised and whether they are importing any equipment, high-tech equipment. In case they are not legalised and in case they are in possession of that equipment, I think it is very dangerous for the country to have them here. So, I would like to seek this clarification from the hon. Minister. Sir, my main intention in seeking this clarification was that when the Vice-President of India visted my State of Goa during 16th to 19th November, 1992, his telephone was tapped by the Inspector-General of Police and he ordered this tapping at the instance of some political power in Goa. And the IGP has confirmed in his letter that he has done that on the pretext of detecting hoax calls. I don't think that it is within the jurisdiction of the State

Government or the State Police. I brought this matter to the notice of the hon. Home Minister. I want to know from the hon. Home Minister whether such a directive has gone to the State Governments to desist from tapping or monitoring the telephone of national leaders. That is all. Thank you, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY) : Shri Ish Dutt Yadav. Not here. Shri Ram Naresh Yadav. Not here. Shri Gurudas Das Gupta.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA (West Bengal) : Sir, in the first instance, most respectfully, I ask the hon. Home Minister as to why this statement has been issued. This is a statement issued by the Home Minister of the country in Parliament. What was the motive in issuing this statement the day after the AICC session has ended at Surajkund. ? What is the reason for issuing this statement ? (*Interruptions*)

AN HON. MEMBER : It is a coincidence.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA : I don't understand the reason. The reason for issuing this statement, to me, appears to be that the Government is saying that on the basis of the evidence collected till now, the HRD Minister has made an irresponsible statement. The only conclusion that one can make from the statement that Mr. Chavan has issued one day after the Surajkund session is that the HRD Minister has made an irresponsible statement. Sir, just two days before, when the hon. Minister issued a statement on some people suspected to be involved in the explosions in Bombay, who had gone to Pakistan, there was a motive in giving that statement. The Government wanted to convey the message to Pakistan that somebody who was a part of the conspiracy had gone there. That was a central point. Similarly, this statement has a central point. The point is to portray the Minister of Human Resource Development as a person who has indulged in irresponsible conduct. I take the message, with the central message of the statement, to be the message and signal of the Government. May I ask the hon. Minister : Does he consider that the public statement that was issued by an important member of the Cabinet was wild and his statement was irresponsible ? My first question to him is : Does he consider that the statement of the HRD Minister pertaining to the allegation of telephone tapping is irresponsible and wild ? This is my first question. My second question flows from it. This is a collective Government with indivisible responsibility.

Mr. Singh is part of the Government, Mr. Chavan is part of the Government and the captain of the Government is the Prime Minister. I would like to ask him : if a member of the Government, so senior as he is, is found to be indulging in trading wild charges against his own Government, does it not tarnish the image of the Government ? If it tantamounts to tarnish the image of the Government, then can be remain in the Government ? Many important questions arise, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, Kindly allow me a little more time. The next very important question that arises is what happens if a person is found to be so irresponsible as to tarnish the image of the Government, when the image of the Government is seriously tarnished ? Because we have no emergency and we have a full-fledged parliamentary democracy, we have a right to dissent, not within Parliament alone but within each and every party. Right to dissent is a democracy right even within the party. We know Mr. Arjun Singh has a different opinion on many issues. This is his right to dissent. Therefore, the only

[Shri Gurudas Das Gupta—contd.]

corollary and conclusion from the statement is that State machinery is being used to suppress dissent within the ruling political party. That is the only conclusion and if that is the conclusion of the statement that has been made by Mr. Chavan, then I would like to ask him whether it does not tantamount to breeding of serious suspicious about the democratic principles of which he and his leadership had been so eloquently speaking in the Surajkund conference. How can democracy function if the telephone of a member of the Government is tapped ? Without having conclusive proof if a person—I am emphasising 'if'—makes a wild and open charge, if that wild charge is made openly, then two issues are involved in it. One is, his charge is wild and he has made the charge openly. Secondly, this open charge creates a serious suspicion about your adherence to the democratic principles. If so, can such a member continue in the Government ?

THE VICE- CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY) : Would you please conclude ?

AN HON. MEMBER : It is only a repetition.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA : Thirdly, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, democracy is good but anarchy is bad. If the telephone tapping is going on, it tantamounts to anarchy, it can be compared with the days of Emergency that was clamped on the country several years ago. Or if a Minister indulges in wild charges, that is also anarchy. Democracies must function on certain principles. There cannot be any anarchy. Therefore, my third question is, are you going to drop Mr. Arjun Singh from the Cabinet because he has been going this irresponsible thing ?

SHRI MOTURU HANUMANTHA RAO (Andhra Pradesh) : Perhaps they are waiting for your suggestion.

THE VICE- CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY) : Mr. Gurudas das Gupta ... (*interruptions*) ...

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA : This is very important, Sir.

THE VICE- CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY) : I know that. I have to give time to the other Members also. I cannot give you more time. You have to conclude now.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA : Yes, Sir, I am concluding. In two minutes, I am concluding.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY) : Kindly conclude please.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA : My point is only one.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY) : The last one.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA : My point is only one. You have given me a chance. Therefore, I am speaking. If this wild charge had not been raised, I would not have spoken. Therefore, my point is, the Government must clear all doubts about who is wrong and who is right. There has to be conclusive proof. This statement is absolutely partial, the intention is only one that Mr. Arjun Singh....

AN HON. MEMBER : Inconclusive... (*interruption*)...

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA : Not only inconclusive and unsubstantiated, it throws a challenge to Mr. Arjun Singh. This statement throws a challenge to Mr. Arjun Singh that if he gives the name of the private agency, then that agency can

be associated and after associating that private agency, things can be known. This is a challenge to Mr. Arjun Singh to say what the agency is. This gives rise to that statement. If it is allowed, I feel really constrained by the statement made by the hon. Member from Goa. If he has not made this statement, I would have taken it with a pinch of salt. If the telephone of the Vice-President of the country can be tapped by the IGP—this is the allegation—then I do believe that the telephone of Mr. Chavan could also be tapped by another Minister of State belonging to the Ministry of Home Affairs because ...(*Interruptions*).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY) : Please conclude now.

SHRI S. S. AHLUWALIA : For how long will he go on like this ? Sir, you have to take notice of this.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY) : Mr. Das Gupta, you have taken more than eight minutes. You have to abide by the time... (*Interruptions*)... I cannot make any distinction between one Member and another. So, kindly conclude now... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI S. S. AHLUWALIA : Sir, he is making a political speech on this.. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA : Political persons are there to make political speeches. Those who are not political persons have to do other things... (*Interruptions*) ...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY) : You have to wind up now, Mr. Gupta... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA : Sir, I know where the shoe pinches. (*Interruptions*)... I know where the shoe pinches (*Interruptions*).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY) : You have to conclude now.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA : Sir, I know where the shoe pinches. Therefore, I am not annoyed by the volley of protests.

It is in the interest of the Government, it is in the interest of the credibility of the Prime Minister, it is for the democracy of this country, that the curtain must be drawn, that the things must be exposed, and we want to know the full truth. The Government cannot go on telling half-truths, but must come to this House with the full truth and full truth must be known.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY) : Now, Dr. Jichkar. You have only two minutes.

DR. SHRIKANT RAMCHANDRA JICHKAR (Maharashtra) : Sir, it has been said that there was no such surveillance and no one was authorised to make such a surveillance. I want to have one small clarification from the honourable Minister because there is a line in the statement which says, "... they have neither authorised such an action nor indeed would it remotely occur to them to do so." The question that I want to put to the honourable Home Minister is who the authority is in the Government who has the powers to sanction such a surveillance in any other case.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY) : Yes, Mr. Minister.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN : Only one minute. Sir ...(*Interruptions*) ...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY) : You have not given your name and from your party one Member has already spoken.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN : I am only requesting you for permission. If you don't permit me, I will not speak. I am only asking for permission.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY) : All right.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN : Sir, the statement by the Minister is about an allegation by another Member of the Cabinet... (*Interruptions*)... I want to have only one clarification. I would like to know from the honourable Minister whether the Government can use the Parliamentary forum to settle scores against one Member of the Cabinet by another ...(*Interruptions*)... If this continues ...(*Interruptions*) ...

SHRI S. S. AHLUWALIA : Why are you interpreting it like this? ...(*Interruptions*)... He has made a statement... (*Interruptions*)... Why are you running away? ...(*Interruptions*)...

DR. SHRIKANT RAMCHANDRA JICHKAR : You demanded a statement from the Minister and he has made a statement. He has not made any suo motu statement ... (*Interruptions*) ...

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN (West Bengal) : Even now nothing new has been said ... (*Interruptions*)... At the time we demanded nothing was said and even now nothing has been said. The statement says that it is still under investigation...(*Interruptions*)... He has agreed to the terms of the Human Resource Development Minister. So, it is not a bald statement which means that it has some motives behind it. That is why I would like the honourable Minister to clarify it. For how long will this practice continue? ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI S. B. CHAVAN : Sir, this has raised a large number of questions. I do not think that I would be able to reply to all the points which the honourable Members have raised.

SHRI G. G. SWELL : Then come out with another statement.

SHRI S. B. CHAVAN : Not necessary. Actually, I would like to refer to the first point which the honourable Member, Shri Gurudas Das Gupta has raised. He has said that this statement has been made after the AICC Session. He is trying to connect both. For his information and for the information of the House, I may say that this statement was to be made in the Lok Sabha. The day on which I was to make the statement there, I had to request the honourable Speaker saying that I could not collect all the facts and that as soon as I succeeded in getting all the facts, I would make the statement. I made this statement this afternoon, at 2–30, in the Lok Sabha and I thought that the same day I should make this statement in this House. This is the only connecting thing between the Lok Sabha and the Rajya Sabha and this has nothing to do with the AICC Session and the kind of statement that has been made. Sir, the statement is absolutely clear that so far as the Government agencies are concerned, we are hundred per cent sure that this has not been done nor are they authorised. The hon. Member has asked as to who is supposed to be the authority who authorises these officers. Actually, such kind of surveillance is not authorised at all by anyone. It is only for criminal purposes. If some criminal activity is going on, and if anyone has to be authorised for that purpose, it is the Director, IB, who authorises the officers to tap the telephones to find out as to whether they are indulging in any kind of criminal activities. But no political surveillance is ever contemplated, and that is why the

DIB was absolutely clear when he said that he has not only not authorised but the question of authorising anyone does not arise. So, that point is very clear. Another point which was raised was that in the interest of the Government, and also in the interest of the person concerned, it will be better if a thorough probe is carried out and the Government comes clean in the matter. Sir, so far as the information available with the Government is concerned, we are absolutely sure that this is the only information available. And in spite of repeated requests, we have not succeeded in getting the name of the agency which has been employed by the hon. Minister. So, we were interested to know because we would like to satisfy not only ourselves but we would like to satisfy that, in fact, what the private agency is indulging into is also being substantiated or he is just trying to take advantage of the situation as it is prevailing. From that point of view, in fact, we were interested...

PROF. SAURIN BHATTACHARYA : The information that you have now given that you have failed to get the name of the private agency even after repeated enquiries is not included in the statement. That information is new.

SHRI S. B. CHAVAN : There are a number of things which we cannot possibly include in the statement unless the hon. Members themselves are very keen to find out. In fact, I wanted to avoid this kind of a questioning. But since you have asked the question, it becomes my duty to respond that we have been waiting for the kind of information that we expect from the hon. Minister.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA : Mr. Chavan, don't you consider this conduct of Mr. Arjun Singh to be more reprehensible ?

SHRI S. B. CHAVAN : I don't think it will be proper on my part to pass any judgment.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA : You are avoiding...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY) : Kindly allow the Minister to reply.

SHRI S. B. CHAVAN : I cannot possibly give any comment on that. It is for the Prime Minister.

Sir, there was another point which was raised by the hon. Member, Shri Fernandes. That was that the telephone of the hon. Vice-President was tapped in order to ascertained whether there were any hoax calls. If the hon. Vice-President had not directed that way, and if the IGP on his own has done it, certainly it is a misconduct for which he will be personally held responsible, and we will take stringent action against him. If the telephone of no less a person than the Vice-President is tapped without his consent, then, of course, it is a very serious matter, and we will call for disciplinary action against him. Then, Sir...

SHRI G. G. SWELL : Why do you avoid my question ?

SHRI S. B. CHAVAN : That is because of the fact that actually so far as Intelligence agencies are concerned, I am not supposed to divulge any information.

SHRI G. G. SWELL : Are you going to use these electronic equipment available to combat terrorists ?

SHRI S. B. CHAVAN : That is a good suggestion which you have given to me. I will definitely pass it on to the Intelligence agencies. But all the details about

the Intelligence agencies and the kind of gadgets that they have with them is a matter which I cannot disclose in this House.

Sir, one point which was raised by Mr. Sukomal Sen was about settling scores on the floor of the House and the Parliamentary forum being used for that kind of a purpose. [8.00 PM] In fact, it was at the instance of the hon. Members that this statement was made. Most reluctantly and most unpleasantly I must say. I have done my duty. I don't think I can add anything more than what I have said.

SHRI SUNIL BASU RAY : Can you assure that such a practice will be stopped ?

SHRI S. B. CHAVAN : There is no practice, I have said. Where is the question of stopping that practice ?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY) : The matter is closed. Now, messages from the Lok Sabha.

MESSAGES FROM THE LOK SABHA

(I) The Himachal Pradesh Appropriation Bill, 1993.

(II) The Himachal Pradesh Appropriation (Vote on Account) Bill, 1993.

(III) The Himachal Pradesh State Legislature (Delegation of Powers) Bill, 1993.

SECRETARY-GENERAL : Sir, I have to report to the House the following messages received from the Lok Sabha, signed by the Secretary-General of the Lok Sabha :—

(I)

"In accordance with the provisions of rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose the Himachal Pradesh Appropriation Bill, 1993, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 29th March, 1993.

2. The Speaker has certified that this Bill is a Money Bill."

(II)

"In accordance with the provisions of rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose the Himachal Pradesh Appropriation (Vote on Account) Bill, 1993, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 29th March, 1993.

2. The Speaker has certified that this Bill is a Money Bill."

(III)

"In accordance with the provisions of rule 120 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to inform you that Lok Sabha, at its sitting held on the 26th March, 1993, agreed without any amendment to the Himachal Pradesh State Legislature (Delegation of Powers) Bill, 1993, which was passed by Rajya Sabha at its sitting held on the 16th March, 1993."

Sir, I lay copy of each of the Himachal Pradesh Appropiration Bill, 1993 and the Himachal Pradesh (Vote on Account) Bill, 1993, on the Table.